

Stronger no-cloning, no-signalling and conservation of quantum information

I. Chakrabarty,^{1,2,*} A. K. Pati,^{3,†} and S. Adhikari^{2,‡}

¹*Heritage Institute of Technology, Kolkata, India*

²*Bengal Engineering and Science University, Howrah-711103, West Bengal, India*

³*Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar-751005, Orissa, India*

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

It is known that the stronger no-cloning theorem and the no-deleting theorem taken together provide the permanence property of quantum information. Also, it is known that the violation of the no-deletion theorem would imply signalling. Here, we show that the violation of the stronger no-cloning theorem could lead to signalling. Furthermore, we prove the stronger no-cloning theorem from the conservation of quantum information. These observations imply that the permanence property of quantum information is connected to the no-signalling and the conservation of quantum information.

Introduction: In recent years it is of fundamental importance to know various differences between classical and quantum information. Many operations which are feasible in digitized information become impossibilities in quantum world. Unlike classical information, in quantum information theory, we cannot clone and delete an arbitrary quantum states which are now known as the no-cloning and the no-deleting theorems [1, 2, 3]. In addition to these two there are many other theorems which come under this broad heading of ‘no-go theorems’ [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. In particular, we have the ‘no-flipping’ [4, 5], the ‘no-self replication’ [6], the ‘no-partial erasure’ [7], the ‘no-splitting’ [8], and few other theorems in the literature. Moreover, the no-cloning, the no-conjugation, and the no-complementing theorems have been unified under a name ‘General Impossible operations’ in quantum Information theory [9].

Now, we know that these impossible theorems can also be derived from the fundamental principles like impossibility of signalling and non-increase of entanglement under local operations for closed systems [10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. For example, the no-deleting theorem was established from the principle of no-signalling between two spatially separated parties [13]. The no-flipping theorem has been obtained from the no-signalling and the non-increase of entanglement under LOCC [14]. Recently, it was shown that the no-cloning and the no-deletion theorems follow from the conservation of quantum information [15]. In strengthening the no-cloning theorem it was proved that in order to make a copy of a set of non-orthogonal states one must supply full information. This is called as the stronger no-cloning theorem [16]. The stronger no-cloning and the no-deleting theorems taken together implies a permanence of quantum information. Since the deletion operation implies signalling one may wonder whether violation of the stronger no-cloning theorem in quantum information could also lead to signalling. If yes, then that would mean that violation of permanence property of quantum information could lead to signalling. In this work we show that indeed principles like no-signalling and conservation of entanglement under LOCC

establish the permanence of quantum information.

Before going into the details, first of all, we should keep in mind that we are treating information not only as knowledge but also as a physical quantity [17]. In fact, there are two opposing concepts regarding information: (i) subjective, according to this information is nothing but knowledge obtained about a system after interacting with it, and (ii) objective, which tells us that information is a physical quantity. Now we must understand what actually we mean by the term permanence of quantum information. It refers to the fact that neither we could create nor destroy quantum information. From the objective viewpoint quantum information resemble like energy which already existed before any physical process has taken place and will continue to exist even after any physical process. Permanence of quantum information is something which is akin to this. It is entirely quantum mechanical in nature and there is no classical analogue.

Recall that the no-cloning theorem states that if $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ is a set of pure non-orthogonal states, then there is no unitary operation that can achieve the transformation $|\psi_i\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle$ [2]. However, the stronger no-cloning theorem states that if $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ is a set of pure states containing no orthogonal pair, then the transformation

$$|\psi_i\rangle|a_i\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle \quad (1)$$

is possible iff $|a_i\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_i\rangle$. That is the second copy $|\psi_i\rangle$ can always be generated from the supplementary information alone, independent of the first copy. Thus in effect cloning of $|\psi_i\rangle$ is possible only when the second copy is provided as an additional input. This is known as the ‘stronger no-cloning theorem’ [16].

Let us briefly recapitulate the stronger no-cloning theorem. Consider a physical process described by the equation

$$|\psi_i\rangle|0\rangle|\alpha_i\rangle|C\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle|C_i\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where $|\psi_i\rangle$ is the copy which is to be cloned and $|0\rangle$ is the blank state. Here $|C\rangle$ is the initial state of the environmental space and $|\alpha_i\rangle$ is the state which already

existed in some other part of the world. Now $|C_i\rangle$ is the output state of the two register which initially contained $|\alpha_i\rangle, |C\rangle$. Since we have included the environmental space in this physical process, we can consider the transformation (2) as a unitary transformation. Hence from unitarity, the sets $\{|\alpha_i\rangle\}$ and $\{|\psi_i\rangle, |C_i\rangle\}$ have equal matrices of inner product. Then, $\{|\alpha_i\rangle\}$ and $\{|\psi_i\rangle, |C_i\rangle\}$ are unitarily equivalent and in advance we can say that $|\psi_i\rangle$ is generated from $|\alpha_i\rangle$ (discarding the ancillary system $|C_i\rangle$). This is known as the ‘Stronger no-cloning’ theorem [16].

Now if we look into the process of deletion of non-orthogonal states we find that the permanence of quantum information plays an important role. Suppose we are provided with two copies $|\psi_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle$ of a quantum state and we wish to delete one copy by some physical operation (a completely positive, trace preserving map) like

$$|\psi_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_i\rangle|0\rangle. \quad (3)$$

Such a physical operation will corresponds to a linear operation if we include ancilla and would be given by

$$|\psi_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle|A\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_i\rangle|0\rangle|A_i\rangle. \quad (4)$$

The no-deleting principle tells us that the second copy $|\psi_i\rangle$ can never be deleted in the sense that $|\psi_i\rangle$ can always be obtained from $|A_i\rangle$.

Thus, we see in both deletion and cloning we obtain a similarity: the first copy provided no assistance in construction of the second copy and in deletion the first copy has not provided any assistance in deleting the second copy. Thus, we can say that the quantum information has some property called permanence which tells us that the creation of copies will only be possible if we import information from some other part which already existed and deletion can only be possible by exporting information to some other part where it will continue to exist.

The aim of this work is basically two fold. In the first part we will show that negating the stronger no-cloning theorem will lead to signalling. Since we already know that negating the no-deletion theorem will lead to signalling [13]. Therefore, together with our proof we can say that the violation of the permanence property of quantum information will lead to signalling. Alternately, we can say that the no-signalling leads to permanence of quantum information. In the second part, we will show that the violation of the stronger no-cloning theorem will lead to the violation of the principle of conservation of entanglement under LOCC (conservation of information). This clearly indicates that the principle of conservation of entanglement under LOCC implies the permanence of quantum information.

Stronger no-cloning from no-signalling: Suppose we have two singlet states $|\chi\rangle, |\xi\rangle$ shared by two distant parties Alice and Bob. Since the singlet states are invariant under local unitary operations, it remains same in all

basis. The states are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} |\chi\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\psi_1\rangle|\overline{\psi_1}\rangle - |\overline{\psi_1}\rangle|\psi_1\rangle) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\psi_2\rangle|\overline{\psi_2}\rangle - |\overline{\psi_2}\rangle|\psi_2\rangle) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\alpha_1\rangle|\overline{\alpha_1}\rangle - |\overline{\alpha_1}\rangle|\alpha_1\rangle) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\alpha_2\rangle|\overline{\alpha_2}\rangle - |\overline{\alpha_2}\rangle|\alpha_2\rangle), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\{|\psi_1\rangle, |\overline{\psi_1}\rangle\}$, $\{|\psi_2\rangle, |\overline{\psi_2}\rangle\}$ are two sets of mutually orthogonal spin states or polarizations in case of photons (qubit basis) for the first entangled pair given by (5) shared between Alice and Bob. Similarly $\{|\alpha_1\rangle, |\overline{\alpha_1}\rangle\}$, $\{|\alpha_2\rangle, |\overline{\alpha_2}\rangle\}$ are two sets of mutually orthogonal spin states (qubit basis) for the second entangled pair (6). Let us write the combined state of the system in an arbitrary qubit basis.

$$|\chi\rangle|\xi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|\psi_i\rangle|\overline{\psi_i}\rangle - |\overline{\psi_i}\rangle|\psi_i\rangle)(|\alpha_i\rangle|\overline{\alpha_i}\rangle - |\overline{\alpha_i}\rangle|\alpha_i\rangle) \quad (7)$$

where $i = 1, 2$. Note that whatever measurement Alice does, Bob does not learn the results and his description will remain as that of a completely random mixture, i.e., $\rho_B = \frac{I}{2} \otimes \frac{I}{2}$. In other words we can say that the local operations performed on her subspace has no effect on Bob’s description of his states.

Now we look out for the equivalent mathematical expression for the statement like ‘negating the stronger no-cloning theorem’. Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_i\rangle|\alpha_i\rangle|C\rangle &\rightarrow |\psi_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle|C_{i1}\rangle \\ |\overline{\psi_i}\rangle|\overline{\alpha_i}\rangle|C\rangle &\rightarrow |\overline{\psi_i}\rangle|\overline{\psi_i}\rangle|C_{i2}\rangle \\ |\psi_i\rangle|\overline{\alpha_i}\rangle|C\rangle &\rightarrow |\phi_i\rangle \\ |\overline{\psi_i}\rangle|\alpha_i\rangle|C\rangle &\rightarrow |\overline{\phi_i}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $i = 1, 2$ and $|\phi_i\rangle, |\overline{\phi_i}\rangle$ are some general states of the combined system. The above equations corresponds to a situation where we are negating stronger no-cloning theorem by allowing the cloning of the input state $|\psi_i\rangle$ to be dependent on the register $|\alpha_i\rangle$. Now, suppose Bob does some local operation on his system by attaching ancilla $|C\rangle$ and applying the transformations given by (8). As a result, the combined system given by (7) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} |\chi\rangle|\xi\rangle|C\rangle &\rightarrow \\ &\frac{1}{2}[|\psi_i\rangle|\alpha_i\rangle(|\overline{\psi_i}\rangle|\overline{\psi_i}\rangle|C_{i2}\rangle) + |\overline{\psi_i}\rangle|\overline{\alpha_i}\rangle(|\psi_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle|C_{i1}\rangle) \\ &+ |\psi_i\rangle|\overline{\alpha_i}\rangle(|\overline{\phi_i}\rangle) + |\overline{\psi_i}\rangle|\alpha_i\rangle(|\phi_i\rangle)]. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Now if Alice finds her particles in the basis $\{|\psi_1\rangle, |\overline{\psi_1}\rangle\}$ and $\{|\alpha_1\rangle, |\overline{\alpha_1}\rangle\}$, the reduced density matrix describing the Bob’s system is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_B &= \frac{1}{4}[|\psi_1\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1\psi_1| + |\overline{\psi_1\psi_1}\rangle\langle\overline{\psi_1\psi_1}| \\ &+ |\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1| + |\overline{\phi_1}\rangle\langle\overline{\phi_1}|]. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Now if Alice finds her particles in the basis $\{|\psi_2\rangle, |\overline{\psi_2}\rangle\}$ and $\{|\alpha_2\rangle, |\overline{\alpha_2}\rangle\}$, the reduced density matrix of Bob's system is given by

$$\rho_B = \frac{1}{4} [|\psi_2\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2\psi_2| + |\overline{\psi_2\psi_2}\rangle\langle\overline{\psi_2\psi_2}| + |\phi_2\rangle\langle\phi_2| + |\overline{\phi_2}\rangle\langle\overline{\phi_2}|]. \quad (11)$$

Since the statistical mixture in (10) and (11) are different, this would allow Bob to distinguish in which basis Alice has performed measurement, thus allowing for super luminal signalling. Thus, we see that the violation of stronger no-cloning theorem will lead to signalling. It had already been seen that the violation of the no-deleting theorem will lead to signalling [13], henceforth we can conclude that the violation of permanence property of quantum information will make super luminal signalling possible.

Stronger no-cloning theorem from conservation of information: Now we will show the principle of conservation of entanglement (conservation of information in a closed system) under LOCC will imply the stronger no-cloning theorem in quantum information. This will prove that if we violate the permanence of quantum information we will also violate the principle of conservation of entanglement (information).

Now negating the stronger no-cloning theorem is equivalent of rejecting the unitary equivalence of two sets of pure states $\{|\alpha_i\rangle\}$ and $\{|\beta_i\rangle\}$ (say) having equal matrices of inner product i.e $\langle\alpha_i|\alpha_j\rangle = \langle\beta_i|\beta_j\rangle$ [16]. In other words we can say that there exists an unitary operator operator U which describe the physical process (2) but violate the condition $\langle\alpha_i|\alpha_j\rangle = \langle\beta_i|\beta_j\rangle$. Now we look out for the equivalent mathematical expression for the statement like 'negating the stronger no-cloning theorem'. Consider the following transformations

$$|\psi_i\rangle|0\rangle|\alpha_i\rangle|C\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle|C_i\rangle \quad (12)$$

$$|\psi_j\rangle|0\rangle|\alpha_j\rangle|C\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_j\rangle|\psi_j\rangle|C_j\rangle \quad (13)$$

and let us negate the stronger no-cloning theorem, i.e., we assume that there exists a unitary operator, for which the inner products are not equal

$$\langle\alpha_i|\alpha_j\rangle \neq \langle\psi_i|\psi_j\rangle\langle C_i|C_j\rangle. \quad (14)$$

Let us consider an entangled state shared by two distant parties Alice and Bob

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [|0\rangle_A |\psi_i\rangle_B |\alpha_i\rangle_B + |1\rangle_A |\psi_j\rangle_B |\alpha_j\rangle_B], \quad (15)$$

where Alice is in possession of the qubit 'A' and Bob is in possession of the qubit 'B'. Now imagine that Bob is in possession of a hypothetical machine whose action on his qubit is given by the transformation defined in (12) and (13). He attaches two ancillas in the state $|0\rangle_B|C\rangle_B$ and carries out the transformation (12) and (13).

The reduced density matrix on Alice side before the application of hypothetical machine is given by

$$\rho^A = \frac{1}{2} [|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 0| \langle\psi_i|\psi_j\rangle \langle\alpha_i|\alpha_j\rangle + |0\rangle\langle 1| \langle\psi_j|\psi_i\rangle \langle\alpha_j|\alpha_i\rangle + |1\rangle\langle 1|]. \quad (16)$$

Now after the application of the transformation defined in (12) and (13) by Bob on his qubits the entangled state takes the form,

$$|\Psi\rangle_{SNC} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [|0\rangle_A |\psi_i\rangle_B |\psi_i\rangle_B |C_i\rangle_B + |1\rangle_A |\psi_j\rangle_B |\psi_j\rangle_B |C_j\rangle_B]. \quad (17)$$

The reduced density matrix on Alice side by tracing out Bob's part is given by

$$\rho_{SNC}^A = \frac{1}{2} [|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 0| \langle\psi_i|\psi_j\rangle^2 \langle C_i|C_j\rangle + |0\rangle\langle 1| \langle\psi_j|\psi_i\rangle^2 \langle C_j|C_i\rangle + |1\rangle\langle 1|]. \quad (18)$$

Now from equation (14) we can say that equations (16) and (18) are not identical. Since transformation defined in (12) and (13) are local operation and there is no classical communication between two distant parties Alice and Bob, to maintain the principle of no signalling the density matrix on Alice's side must remain unchanged. A different density matrix on Alice's side will imply that the signalling has taken place.

Let us consider the entangled state given by equation (15), which is shared by two distant parties Alice and Bob. The largest eigen value of the reduced density matrix (16) on Alice's side is given by

$$\lambda^A = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{|a||b|}{2} \quad (19)$$

and the largest eigen value of the density matrix (18) on Alice's side after the application transformation defined in (12) and (13) is given by

$$\lambda_{SNC}^A = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{|a|^2|c|}{2}, \quad (20)$$

where $a = \langle\psi_i|\psi_j\rangle$, $b = \langle\alpha_i|\alpha_j\rangle$ and $c = \langle C_i|C_j\rangle$.

Now from equation (14) it is clear that equations (19) and (20) are not identical. This violates the principle of conservation of entanglement under LOCC. Thus we again observe that by violating the permanence property of quantum information we are violating the principle of conservation of entanglement under LOCC or in other words we can say that the principle of conservation of entanglement (conservation of information) under LOCC implies the permanence property of quantum information.

Conclusion: In summary, we have shown that if we could negate the stronger no-cloning theorem then we could send signal faster than light. Thus, the stronger

no-cloning follows from the no-signalling. Earlier, it has been shown that negating the no-deletion theorem also leads to signalling [13]. Since the stronger no-cloning and the no-deleting theorems taken together provide permanence to quantum information, this in turn implies that the violation of the permanence property of quantum information could also lead to signalling condition. In other words the only possibility that we can import and export quantum information without being able to create or destroy is consistent with no-signalling condition. Also, we have proved the stronger no-cloning theorem from the conservation of quantum information under LOCC operation.

Acknowledgement: Indranil and Satyabrata acknowledge Prof B. S. Choudhuri, Head of the Department of Mathematics, Bengal Engineering and Science University. Indranil acknowledge Prof C. G. Chakraborti, S.N.Bose Professor of Theoretical Physics, Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Calcutta for being the source of inspiration in carrying out research. This work is done in Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, Orissa. Indranil and Satyabrata gratefully acknowledge their hospitality and also acknowledge Dr. P. Agarwal for having various useful discussions. Authors also acknowledge Dr. G. P. Kar for giving various useful suggestions and encouragement for the improvement of the work.

[†] Electronic address: akpati@iopb.res.in

[‡] Electronic address: satyyabrata@yahoo.com

- [1] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, Nature **299**, 802(1982).
- [2] H. P. Yuen, Phys. Lett. A **113**, 405 (1986).
- [3] A. K. Pati and S. L. Braunstein, Nature **404**, 164(2000).
- [4] V. Buzek, M. Hillery and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **60**, R2626 (1999).
- [5] N. Gisin and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 432 (1999).
- [6] A. K. Pati and S. L. Braunstein, Quantum Mechanical Universal Constructor, quant-ph/0303124.
- [7] A. K. Pati and B. C. Sanders, No partial erasure of quantum information, quant-ph/0503138.
- [8] D. Zhou, B. Zeng, and L. You, Quantum information cannot be split into complementary parts, quant-ph/0503168.
- [9] A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 062319 (2002).
- [10] N. Gisin, Phys. Lett. A **242**, 1 (1998).
- [11] L. Hardy and D. D. Song, Phys. Lett. A **259**, 331(1999).
- [12] A. K. Pati, Phys. Lett. A **270**, 103 (2000).
- [13] A. K. Pati and S. L. Braunstein, Phys. Lett. A **315**, 208 (2003).
- [14] I. Chattopadhyay, S. K. Choudhary, G. Kar, S. Kunkri, and D. Sarkar, Phys. Lett. A **351**, 384 (2006).
- [15] M. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, A. Sen(De) and U. Sen, No-deleting and no-cloning principles as consequences of conservation of quantum information, quant-ph/0306044.
- [16] R. Jozsa, A Stronger no-cloning theorem, quant-ph/0204153.
- [17] R. Landauer, Physics Today **44(5)**, 22 (1991).

* Electronic address: indranilc@indiainfo.com